

REMARKS

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks Examiner Nguyen for the telephonic interview conducted April 14, 2009. Applicant was represented by Mr. Jeffrey Barclay (Reg. No. 48,950) and Mr. Indranil Sarkar.

Applicant's representatives discussed the pending claims and some of the references cited in the April 3, 2009 Office Action. Some of the remarks presented below reflect the discussions held with the Examiner.

Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37 and 39-43 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 28 and 35 being independent. Claims 1, 28 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

Favorable reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested in view of the following comments of the Applicants, which are preceded by related comments of the Examiner in small bold type.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner states:

Claims 1,6-8, 18-21,27, 28, 30-32, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila, Avant, and Pedersen et al.

Morgan et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila, and Avant teach all the limitations of the claims except for a second emergency equipment station that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station. However, Pedersen et al. discloses a second emergency equipment station 30/40 that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station 20 (see figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Morgan et al., Nishimoto et al., Deavila, and Avant with a second emergency equipment station that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station as suggested by Pedersen et al.

Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejections with respect to these claims. However, in order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 28 and 35 to recite

“...a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations configured to pass signals between at least the first emergency equipment station and the remote station.” Applicant contends that Morgan, Nishimoto, Deavila, Avant, and Pedersen, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the foregoing feature of the independent claims.

Independent Claim 1

Morgan, Nishimoto, Avant, Deavila, and Pedersen, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest “...a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations configured to pass signals between at least the first emergency equipment station and the remote station” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner is understood to agree that Morgan, Nishimoto, Avant and Deavila, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the second emergency equipment station and relies on Pedersen to allegedly disclose this feature. Applicant contends that Pedersen also does not disclose or suggest a second emergency equipment station that is “...configured to pass signals between at least the first emergency equipment station and the remote station.”

The Examiner seems to construe the fire fighting trucks 30 and aircrafts 40 of Pedersen to be emergency equipment stations. These fire fighting trucks and aircrafts communicate with a fire control headquarter. However, such communications do not pass through another fire fighting truck or aircraft or any other substantially similar emergency equipment station as construed by the examiner. Indeed for this reason, FIG. 2 of Pedersen does not show any communication links between the trucks and aircrafts 30, 40. For at least the foregoing reasons, Pedersen fails to disclose or suggest “...a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations configured to pass signals between at least the first emergency equipment station and the remote station” and therefore fails to cure the admitted deficiency of Morgan, Nishimoto, Avant and Deavila. Independent claim 1 is therefore believed to be patentable. Dependent claims 6-8, 18-21 and 27 are also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable.

Independent Claim 28

Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to include subject matter that is similar to independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 28 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable.

The dependent claims 30-32 and 40-43 are also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 28 is patentable.

Independent Claim 35

Claim 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila, Avant and Pedersen et al.

Cronin et al. in view of Nishimoto et al., Deavila, and Avant teach all the limitations of the claims except for a second emergency equipment station that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station. However, Pedersen et al. disclose a second emergency equipment station 30/40 that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station 20 (see figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have provided the device of Cronin et al. and Nishimoto et al., Deavila, and Avant with a second emergency equipment station that is configured to pass signals between the detector and the remote central station as suggested by Pedersen et al. Doing so would provide an effective and versatile emergency station.

Claim 35 is amended to recite "...a second emergency equipment station in a system of emergency equipment stations configured to pass signals between at least the first emergency equipment station and the remote station." The Examiner is understood to agree that no combination of Cronin, Nishimoto, Deavila and Avant teaches a second emergency equipment station and relies on Pedersen to allegedly disclose this feature. As mentioned above with respect to claim 1, Pedersen also fails to disclose or suggest the foregoing feature of amended independent claim 35. Therefore, claim 35 is believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 1 is patentable. Dependent claims 36, 37 and 39 are also believed to be patentable for at least the reasons for which claim 35 is patentable.

Double Patenting

The Examiner states:

Claims 1, 6-10, 18-25, 27, 28, 30-37, 39-43 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No. 7,271,704 in view of Deavila, Avant and Pedersen et al.

Applicant will consider filing a terminal disclaimer upon the removal of the pending claim rejections and identification of allowable subject matter.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 04373-0033001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 July 2009



Jeffrey J. Barclay
Reg. No. 48,950

Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945